

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Raymond Ballister Jr., Esq., SBN 111282  
Russell Handy, Esq., SBN 195058  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Zachary Best, Esq., SBN 166035  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
amandas@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Samuel Love,**

Plaintiff,

**v.**

**Cartwright Hotel Group, LP,** a  
Washington Limited Partnership;  
**The General Partner is**  
**Cartwright Hotel, Inc.,** a  
Washington Corporation;

Defendants,

**Case No.**

**Complaint For Damages And  
Injunctive Relief For  
Violations Of:** Americans With  
Disabilities Act; Unruh Civil  
Rights Act

Plaintiff Samuel Love complains of Cartwright Hotel Group, LP, a Washington Limited Partnership; The General Partner is Cartwright Hotel, Inc., a Washington Corporation; (“Defendants”), and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES:**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. He is substantially limited in his ability to walk. He is a paraplegic. He uses a wheelchair for mobility.

1       2. Defendant of Cartwright Hotel Group, LP, a Washington Limited  
2 Partnership; The General Partner is Cartwright Hotel, Inc., a Washington  
3 Corporation owns and operates The Cartwright Hotel - Union Square located  
4 at 524 Sutter St., San Francisco, California currently and at all times relevant  
5 to this complaint.

6       3. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
7 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
8 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
9 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
10 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein, is  
11 responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a necessary  
12 party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when  
13 the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of other  
14 Defendants are ascertained.

15  
16       **JURISDICTION:**

17       4. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
18 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
19 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

20       5. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
21 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
22 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights  
23 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

24       6. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and is  
25 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
26 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

7. This is a lawsuit challenging the reservation policies and practices of a place of lodging. Plaintiff does not know if any physical or architectural barriers exist at the hotel and, therefore, is not claiming that the hotel has violated any construction-related accessibility standard. Instead, this is about the lack of information provided on the hotel's reservation website that would permit plaintiff to determine if there are rooms that would work for him.

8. After decades of research and findings, Congress found that there was a "serious and pervasive social problem" in America: the "discriminatory effects" of communication barriers to persons with disability. The data was clear and embarrassing. Persons with disabilities were unable to "fully participate in all aspects of society," occupying "an inferior status in our society," often for no other reason than businesses, including hotels and motels, failed to provide information to disabled travelers. Thus, Congress decided "to invoke the sweep of congressional authority" and issue a "national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities," and to finally ensure that persons with disabilities have "equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living" and self-sufficiency.

9. As part of that effort, Congress passed detailed and comprehensive regulations about the design of hotels and motels. But, as importantly, Congress recognized that the physical accessibility of a hotel or motel means little if the 61 million adults living in America with disabilities are unable to determine which hotels/motels are accessible and to reserve them. Thus, there is a legal mandate to provide a certain level of information to disabled travelers.

10. But despite the rules and regulations regarding reservation procedures, a 2019 industry article noted that: "the hospitality sector has largely overlooked the importance of promoting accessible features to travelers."

1 11. These issues are of paramount important. Persons with severe  
2 disabilities have modified their own residences to accommodate their unique  
3 needs and to ameliorate their physical limitations. But persons with disabilities  
4 are never more vulnerable than when leaving their own residences and having  
5 to travel and stay at unknown places of lodging. They must be able to ascertain  
6 whether those places work for them.

7  
8 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

9 12. Plaintiff planned on making a trip in February of 2021 to the San  
10 Francisco, California, area.

11 13. He chose The Cartwright Hotel - Union Square located at 524 Sutter St.,  
12 San Francisco, California because this hotel was at a desirable price and  
13 location.

14 14. Plaintiff needs an accessible guestroom. He needs clearance around  
15 beds, he needs accessible restroom facilities including accessible sinks,  
16 accessible tubs or showers and accessible toilets. He needs sufficient  
17 maneuvering clearance in and around the guestroom. He needs accessories to  
18 be located within an accessible reach range. In short, he benefits from and  
19 needs compliant accessible guestroom features.

20 15. While sitting bodily in California, Plaintiff went to The Cartwright Hotel  
21 reservation website at [https://www.bestwestern.com/en\\_US/book/hotels-in-](https://www.bestwestern.com/en_US/book/hotels-in-san-francisco/the-cartwright-hotel-union-square-bw-premier-collection/propertyCode.05738.html)  
22 [san-francisco/the-cartwright-hotel-union-square-bw-premier-](https://www.bestwestern.com/en_US/book/hotels-in-san-francisco/the-cartwright-hotel-union-square-bw-premier-collection/propertyCode.05738.html)  
23 [collection/propertyCode.05738.html](https://www.bestwestern.com/en_US/book/hotels-in-san-francisco/the-cartwright-hotel-union-square-bw-premier-collection/propertyCode.05738.html) seeking to book an accessible room at  
24 the location on October 12, 2020.

25 16. Plaintiff found that there was little information about the accessibility  
26 of the rooms. For example, under the various rooms description it mentions  
27 features such as: “Roll in Shower”, and “Mobility Accessible”. These vague  
28 and conclusory statements offer little detail. For example, there is no specific

1 information on whether the desk/table in the room is accessible, if the  
2 common areas are accessible, or if the room has accessible clear floor space.

3 17. The defendant's reservation system failed to identify and describe the  
4 accessible features in the guestroom chosen by the plaintiff in enough detail to  
5 reasonably permit him to assess independently whether the particular  
6 guestroom met his accessibility needs.

7 18. This lack of information created difficulty for the plaintiff and the idea  
8 of trying to book this room -- essentially ignorant about its accessibility --  
9 caused discomfort for the Plaintiff.

10 19. Plaintiff would like to patronize this hotel but is deterred from doing so  
11 because of the lack of detailed information through the hotel's reservation  
12 system. Plaintiff not only travels frequently but is always on the lookout for  
13 businesses that violate the law and discriminate against him and other persons  
14 with disabilities, intending to have them comply with the law and pay statutory  
15 penalties.

16  
17 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS**  
18 **WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all  
19 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

20 20. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
21 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
22 complaint.

23 21. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to make reasonable  
24 modifications in policies, practices, or procedures when such modifications  
25 are necessary to afford goods, services, facilities, privileges advantages or  
26 accommodations to person with disabilities unless the entity can demonstrate  
27 that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the those goods,  
28 services, facilities, privileges advantages or accommodations. See 42 U.S.C. §

1 12182(B)(2)(A)(ii).

2 22. Specifically, with respect to reservations by places of lodging, a  
3 defendant must ensure that its reservation system, including reservations  
4 made by “any means,” including by third parties, shall:

- 5 a. Ensure that individuals with disabilities can make  
6 reservations for accessible guest rooms during the same  
7 hours and in the same manner as individuals who do not  
8 need accessible rooms;
- 9 b. Identify and describe accessible features in the hotels and  
10 guest rooms offered through its reservations service in  
11 enough detail to reasonably permit individuals with  
12 disabilities to assess independently whether a given hotel  
13 or guest room meets his or her accessibility needs; and
- 14 c. Reserve, upon request, accessible guest rooms or specific  
15 types of guest rooms and ensure that the guest rooms  
16 requested are blocked and removed from all reservations  
17 systems.

18 *See* 28 C.F.R. § 36.302(e).

19 23. Here, the defendant failed to modify its reservation policies and  
20 procedures to ensure that it identified and described accessible features in the  
21 hotels and guest rooms in enough detail to reasonably permit individuals with  
22 disabilities to assess independently whether a given hotel or guest room meets  
23 his or her accessibility needs and failed to ensure that individuals with  
24 disabilities can make reservations for accessible guest rooms during the same  
25 hours and in the same manner as individuals who do not need accessible  
26 rooms.

1 **II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL**  
 2 **RIGHTS ACT** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
 3 Code § 51-53.)

4 24. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
 5 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
 6 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, inter alia,  
 7 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
 8 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
 9 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
 10 Civ. Code §51(b).

11 25. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
 12 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

13 26. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
 14 Unruh Act by, inter alia, failing to comply with the ADA with respect to its  
 15 reservation policies and practices.

16 27. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty  
 17 and discomfort for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each responsible for  
 18 statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. *See* Civ. Code § 52(a).

19  
 20 **PRAYER:**

21 Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
 22 relief as follows:

23 1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
 24 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
 25 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
 26 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

27 2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
 28 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

1        3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
2 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code § 52(a).

3  
4 Dated: December 14, 2020

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

5  
6   
7

8 By: \_\_\_\_\_

9 Russell Handy, Esq.

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28